3rd August 1932] [Mr. V. T. Arasu]

see that by means of this Act unscrupulous medical practitioners do not take undue advantage over the other medical practitioners by associating with them unregistered medical men. With these few words, I support the motion that this Bill be passed into law."

Khan Sahib SYED TAJUDDIN SAHIB Bahadur:—" Mr. President, Sir, the present amendment is not only a desideratum but a dire necessity. The section which prohibited medical practitioners from associating with unregistered practitioners was something like a blot on the Statute Book. The hon. Sir Mahomed Usman who himself comes from an eminent family of physicians found the injustice of it long ago and as the Chairman of the Committee entered a strong protest in his name. Some time elapsed before it struck me as well. I was not able to steer the Bill through this Council and Mr. Daniel Thomas was good enough to take the responsibility for piloting the Bill and he did not spare any pains to see that the Bill was passed into law. In this connexion, Sir, I have to thank first, the hon. Sir Mahomed Usman, secondly Mr. Daniel Thomas, then the members of the Select Committee and also the members of the House for their cordial support and encouragement. Mr. President, internationalism is the order of the day. Present day civilization entirely depends upon the continuous and slow intercourse of people belonging to different nations and different traditions. Not only food and clothing but also a host of other necessaries of life are being gathered from all parts of the world. Even the dining table and the drawing-room are becoming international in their nature. If we turn to science, most of the science, e.g., chemistry, physics, mathematics, are all international. The scientific societies of the world have begun to promote free social intercourse between various nations and various countries. So, this measure is in keeping with the general trend of the modern world. Not only that; I think this kind of healthy co-operation and free exchange of ideas will go a great way towards relieving the suffering humanity. I thank the Government for the cordial support they have accorded to the Bill."

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed into law.

V.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920, AND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920 (BILL No. 25 OF 1931.)

* Mr. F. BIRLEY:—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move— 1 p.m.

'that the Bill to amend the District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members:—

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
Mr. E. Conran Smith.
Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
The Raja of Kallikote.
Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.
Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.

Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
,, F. G. Luker.
,, R. Foulkes.
,, F. Birley (Mover).'

"Mr. President, the purpose of this Bill is perfectly clear. It seeks to limit the amount of the licence fee levied by a district board on a bus to a maximum of Rs. 100. As is well known, at the present time district boards are levying licence fees, which in some cases exceed Rs. 2,000 in the case of a single bus. It is evident that for some time the district boards have looked upon the licence fee as a method of taxation and a source of income in return for the use of the roads. There are differing views as to whether in law a licence fee can be so used and it is interesting to observe that in a recent case arising out of the licence fee levied, on which matter this Bill endeavours to legislate, the views of two distinguished Judges differed.

"This Bill, however, does not base itself upon the legal interpretation of the term 'licence fee'. It bases itself on two points: first, that there should be some uniformity in method and amount in the taxation of this form of transport; secondly, that the intention of the Madras Motor Vehicles Act should be fulfilled. In the Preamble to this Act, it is stated:

'Whereas it is expedient to abolish the levy of taxes on motor vehicles by local bodies within the Presidency and whereas it is also expedient to provide for the levy of a provincial tax on motor vehicles in the Presidency.'

"It was obviously the intention of the framers of this Act that provincial taxation should take the place of local and district taxation. This intention has been fulfilled in the Madras City where there is no district or municipal licence fee. In regard to district board areas it may be necessary, of course, to make alterations in the amount of the provincial tax in order to adjust the revenue derived thereby to the needs of the district, but there is no doubt that the logical sequence to the Act which was placed on the Statute Book in 1931 is that the tax on motor vehicles should be a provincial matter.

"I have pointed out earlier that this Bill seeks to limit the amount of the licence fees levied by a district board in respect of buses to a maximum of Rs. 100 per annum. There are two points in connexion with this maximum figure which I would emphasize. In the first place, the object of fixing a maximum is to allow of variations according to the size of districts and the number of buses plying in those districts. In a district, for example, where there may be only 30 or 40 buses running, the expenses in connexion with issuing licences would be very small, and therefore the amount of the licence fee might be nominal, because no separate staff would be required. On the other hand, in larger districts where the number of buses may run into some hundreds, it is reasonable that the district board should levy a fee which is nearer the maximum allowed by this Bill because a special staff would be necessary. In the second place, I do not tie myself absolutely to the figure of Rs. 100 as the maximum. The actual figure

3rd August 1932] [Mr. F. Birley]

would be a matter for the Select Committee to decide, bearing in mind the general purpose of the Bill to fix an amount suitable to the purpose of a licence fee.

" There is not the slightest doubt that the combination of the provincial tax and the licence fee is steadily breaking up the motor bus traffic and figures will doubtless be given in the course of this discussion to show to what extent buses have been driven off the road. I think the House will agree with me that the opening up of the country which is not touched by the railway through the medium of bus routes is a very important line of development which deserves every encouragement. During the last two years, however, this form of transport has received every conceivable discouragement. In addition to the heavy increase of local taxes, there has also been a heavy increase of duties on the import of buses, petrol, tyres, spare parts, etc. We in this province are not responsible for that increase in the import duties; but we are responsible for seeing that the local taxes borne by this industry in the Presidency are not such as to discourage its development. At the present moment, the industry is taxed by the local bodies to an extent not known in any part of the world, let alone India, and this is partly due to the fact that apart from the Government of India there are in this Presidency at present two different taxing authorities, each concerned to get its maximum out of this unfortunate trade. The proper taxing authority is the Local Government which is concerned to raise money for the roads and which is also concerned vitally in the encouragement of this industry. The proper licensing authority is the district board, which must have control over the buses which ply within its areas. If these principles are understood and appreciated, there can be no doubt that the Select Committee will very soon come to a reasonable agreement as to the actual figure of the maximum licence fee.

" Earlier in my speech I have referred to the intention of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act. Whatever was the intention of that Bill as originally drafted, the effects of the Act as passed by this House have proved to be little short of calamitous.

" Mr. President, Sir, it was never the intention of the drafters of that Bill to impose an intolerable burden on mechanical transport—there was equally no intention to deprive the district boards and municipalities of the revenue necessary to keep their roads in proper repair. Let us therefore be perfectly frank about the situation. Government is in a quandary; the bus industry is in a mess; the allied trades and industries are wallowing in a slough of despond; the local boards and municipalities are wringing their hands. Are we not, Sir, capable of finding a solution for all these difficulties? I think we are and I think that my Bill is the first step in the right direction—but it is only a step. I trust, therefore, that the House will accept my motion and refer this Bill to the Select Committee which I have mentioned."

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—" I second it."

Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar :—" Sir, I beg to move—

'*that the name of Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan be added to the list of Members of the Select Committee*'."

Mr. A. B. Shetty :—" I second it."

Mr. F. Birley :—" I accept it."

The amendment to add the name of Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan was put and carried.

* The hon. the President :—" The question is—

'*that the Bill No. 25 of 1931 be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Members as per list already mixed and which was further amended by Mr. Manikkavelu Nayakar*'."

The motion was carried.

VI.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS IMPARTIBLE ESTATES ACT, 1904.

Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo :—" Mr. President, I beg to move for leave to introduce the Bill to amend the Madras Impartible Estates Act, 1904."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo :—" Sir, I introduce the Bill."

VII.—THE KAPILESWARAPURAM IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami :—" Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce the Kapileswarapuram Impartible Estates Bill."

Mr. K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami :—" I introduce the Bill."

VIII.—THE MANGAVARAM, ANAKAPALLE AND NAKKAPALLE IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

Mr. R. M. Palat :—" Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce the Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Estates Bill."

Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. R. M. Palat :—" I introduce the Bill."

IX.—THE MANGAVARAM, ANAKAPALLE AND NAKKAPALLE IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri :—" Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce the Mangavaram, Anakapalle and Nakkapalle Impartible Estates Bill."

Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri :—" I introduce the Bill."